

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

The Examiner states that restriction to one of the following is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

Group I: Claims 1-8, classified in Class 714, Subclass 701;

Group II: Claims 9-14, classified in Class 714, Subclass 786;

Group III: Claims 15-17, classified in Class 714, Subclass 790; or

Group IV: Claims 18-20, classified in Class 714, Subclass 790.

Applicants provisionally elect, without prejudice and with traverse, Group I, containing Claims 1-8, for examination on the merits.

The restriction requirement of Group I and Group III is respectfully traversed. Applicants traverse the restriction requirement because it is believed that Claims 1-8 and Claims 15-17 may be combined and examined as one group of claims, rather than the two groups as indicated by the Examiner.

Group I relates to a method for rearranging sub-codes by rearranging sub-codes of a sub-code set with a same or different code rate, and Group III relates to an apparatus for rearranging sub-codes comprising controller for rearranging sub-codes in sub-code sets of quasi-complementary turbo codes (QCTCs) corresponding to a plurality of given code rates and a puncturing and repetition control signal. Specifically, Claim 4 of Group I recites a matrix performing puncturing and repetition; Group III also recites this element. The apparatus of Group III rearranges and stores the sub-codes of sub-code sets in advance and then, if a transmission is requested, one of the sub-codes is selected and transmitted; Group I describes one of the rearranging operations performed in parallel for a plurality of sub-code sets. It is respectfully submitted that Groups I and III are directed to the same invention and should be

examined together. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement of Group I and Group III is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully propose that Group I and Group III above can be classified into one group. No benefit is derived from maintaining the two-group restriction requirement, and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement, restricting Group I and Group III into two groups is respectfully requested. As the M.P.E.P. states, separate classification is not sufficient if the entire case can be searched at once without serious burden, and it is respectfully submitted that withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement regarding Group I and Group III is warranted, and reclassification of Claims 1-8 and 15-17 into a single group is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner agree, Claims 1-8 and 15-17 would remain in the case for examination on the merits.

Should the Examiner disagree, as stated above, Applicants elect Group I, containing Claims 1-8, and also reserve the right to file a divisional application to the non-elected claims.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr